



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/736,282 | 12/15/2003 | Hiroshi Nakahata | AA556C | 4285 |

27752 7590 05/01/2008
THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION - WEST BLDG.
WINTON HILL BUSINESS CENTER - BOX 412
6250 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HAND, MELANIE JO

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3761

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

05/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 3761

With respect to arguments regarding the rejection of claims 1-18: Applicant's arguments in their entirety regarding the rejection of these claims are directed to the Nakahata reference alone. Such arguments are not sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1-18 because the rejection is over the combination of the Nakahata and Malowaniec references. It is clear from the rejection of claim 1 in the last and previous Office actions that it is the Malowaniec reference that teaches an extensibility controlling means as disclosed and claimed, thus remedying that particular deficiency of Nakahata. Applicant merely states on page 2 that it is their position that Malowaniec does not remedy the deficiency of Nakahata regarding the extensibility controlling means, but does not properly argue why Malowaniec does not remedy this deficiency and continues instead to argue what is or what is not taught or suggested in the Nakahata reference.

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 2-6 appear to be based upon applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 and are thus also not persuasive to overcome the rejections of those claims.